REMARKS

New claims 13-22 have been added. Claims 1-12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 13-22 are currently pending in the above-identified application.

Priority

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim for priority and receipt of the priority document.

Information Disclosure Statement

On February 7, 2002, Applicants filed an Information Disclosure Statement. However the Examiner has not returned an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 Form. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner initial and return a copy of the PTO-1449 Form.

Amendments to the Specification

With regard to Figs. 2, 4 and 8, the specification has been amended in a manner consistent with the drawings, namely, references to items 206, 408, and 816 have been added to the specification, as set forth in detail above in the section of this paper entitled "Amendments to the Specification".

Additionally, the word "written" in the second line of the first full paragraph of page 13 of the specification has been changed to "read" to correct a typographical error. This change is supported by "The read head 106 repeatedly reads certain sectors…" as set forth at page 11, lines 2-3.

Drawings

Fig. 5 has been corrected as required by the Examiner, so that all reference characters are mentioned in the specification. It is believed that the amendments to the specification and drawings correct any errors which caused the Examiner to object to the drawings.

35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 3-6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Weng (U.S. Patent No. 5,321,703). Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weng in view of Armstrong et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,321,703). These rejections are traversed as follows.

Under the present invention, as set forth in the new claims 13-22, a first error detection and correction is performed which does not need to read the data a plurality of

times during reproduction of the data in order to detect or correct an error in the data. If the first error detection and correction cannot detect or correct an error in the data, then an area is read a plurality of times during reproduction of data recorded on a recording medium. Thus, the invention is useful in cases where error detection and correction is first performed using standard methods, such as Reed-Solomon code. If the conventional method is insufficient, then, under the present invention, an area is read a plurality of times, comparing data values, and judging whether an error has occurred. Neither Weng, nor Armstrong disclose such an error correction method for a storage device. Weng teaches a reconstruction function for decoding data. Armstrong is directed to error correction without performing a significant number of re-read operations. Thus, neither Weng, nor Armstrong, nor the other art of record, taken either singly, or in combination, teach the method of the invention. Accordingly, new claims 13-22 are asserted to be patentable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that the above-identified application is

now in condition for examination. Accordingly,

reconsideration and reexamination.

Respectfully submitted,

for Shrinath Malur *RN 21,021*
Registration No. 34,663
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: October 22, 2004

14